

REMARKS

The present reply is responsive to the Office Action dated November 15, 2004. Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-9 are again presented for consideration.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Clayton et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,665,190 ("*Clayton*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Clayton is directed to a modular PC card including removable modules. "The PC Card modules 12 are removably inserted into the modular PC Card 10 to provide desired functionality to the PC Card 10." (Col. 4, lns. 30-32.) As pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action, *Clayton* discloses one or more slots 28. (See Office Action, page 2, numbered paragraph 2.) *Clayton* expressly defines the term 'slot' "to refer to the receptacle or void in which the module 12 is inserted." (Col. 4, lns. 29-30.)

The Examiner contends that *Clayton* discloses "a guide support (generally comprising area which surrounds and receives integrated circuit chip and guides the insertion path of the integrated circuit chip, the guide support comprises the side of 18 and 32 which face the inserted integrated circuit chip, the section of base support 31 of the main body unit which supports the inserted integrated circuit chip, and the side wall opposing side of 18 which also faces the inserted circuit chip) provided in each of said loading sections." (Office Action, pgs. 2-3, numbered paragraph 2.) In rejecting claims 1-8, the Examiner asserted "Applicant's own specification and figures do not show special guide features." (Office Action, numbered paragraph 4, pg. 6.) Therefore, "[e]ven if a guide support was not shown or mentioned in a reference disclosing an adapter which receives an inserted circuit chip, it would be inherent that the adapter has

a recess for receiving the inserted circuit chip and the such recess is bounded by walls or guides which necessarily allow the circuit chip to be inserted which would inherently function to guide the circuit chip. As mentioned above, Applicant's own specification and figures do not show special guide features." (Office Action, numbered paragraph 4, pg. 7.)

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contentions, which are apparently based on the presumption that the instant application only discloses conventional flat sidewalls along the adapter and the chip. However, as is clearly shown in FIG. 6, the guide support and guide support unit are significantly different from the flat sidewalls disclosed in Clayton. For example, lateral surfaces 22b and 22c of the loading section 22 have "guide recesses 26 for guiding the insertion or ejection of the memory chip 27 and for controlling its loading position." (Specification at paragraph 0039.) Also shown in FIG. 6 is memory chip 27. Surface 22c of the memory chip has a "protuberantly formed [] guide section 32 adapted for guiding the insertion of the main body unit 28 of the chip into the loading section 22 to guide the insertion or ejection of the memory chip 27. (Specification at paragraph 0041.) These features are not inherent in a flat walled adapter, and are not present in *Clayton*.

Independent claims 1-2 and 5-6 have been amended to clarify the fact that the guide support and the guide support unit significantly differ from conventional planar sidewalls. Specifically, independent claims 1, 2 and 5 now require that the guide support include "a pair of guide recesses formed along said pair of sidewalls of said loading section." Independent claim 6 has been amended to require "a guide support unit including a pair of protuberantly formed guide sections provided on said pair of sidewalls of said main body unit for guiding the

insertion of said main body unit into a pair of guide recesses disposed along sidewalls of the adaptor device." It is believed that these amendments do not necessitate a new search, as they merely clarify previously presented limitations.

A thorough examination of *Clayton* does not reveal any teaching or suggestion of a "guide support" or a "guide support unit" provided in each of the loading sections as required by amended claims 1-2 and 5-6. *Clayton* is deficient in anticipating the claimed invention because it does not include each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, because *Clayton* lacks a disclosure or teaching of all of the elements of independent claims 1, 2, 5 and 6, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of these claims. Claims 3-4 and 7-8 depend from claims 2 and 6, respectively, and contain all of the limitations thereof as well as other limitations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, applicants submit that the dependent claims are likewise patentable.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Fan*, U.S. Patent No. 6,665,736 ("*Fan*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to require "a guide support unit including a pair of protuberantly formed guide sections provided on said pair of sidewalls of said main body unit for guiding the insertion of said main body unit into or removal of said main body unit from a pair of guide recesses disposed along sidewalls of the adaptor device." It is believed that this amendment does not necessitate a new search, as it merely clarifies a previously presented limitation.

Fan discloses a "dummy card" that is inserted into a dual in line memory module (DIMM). The dummy card includes some circuitry and leads for passing electrical and/or power signals

through the card. (See col. 5, lns. 1-22; see also FIGS. 4A-B.) However, as in *Clayton*, a thorough examination of *Fan* does not reveal any disclosure, teaching or suggestion of a "guide support unit" as specified in amended claim 9. *Fan* does not include each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, because *Fan* lacks a disclosure or teaching of all of the elements of independent claim 9, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claim.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Andrew T. Zidel
Registration No.: 45,256
LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant